



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*mn*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/586,410	06/01/2000	Mark Clark	00 P 7661 US	6338

7590 08/03/2007  
Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
186 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER
----------

NAHAR, QAMRUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2191

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/03/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/586,410

Applicant(s)

CLARK ET AL.

Examiner

Qamrun Nahar

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-11,13-16 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-11,13-16 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 05/21/2007.
2. The objection to claim 6 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
3. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement to claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16 and 18 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
4. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement to claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16 and 18 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
5. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention to claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16 and 18 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
6. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter to claims 1, 3-5, 16 and 18 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
7. Claims 1, 6, 11, 16 and 18 have been amended.
8. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16 and 18 are pending.

### ***Response to Amendment***

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2191

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (U.S. 5,230,049) in view of Bapat (U.S. 5,291,583), and further in view of Li (U.S. 6,063,133).

**Per Claim 1:**

Chang teaches a system ("system" in column 2, lines 46-47 and Fig. 1), comprising: a translator on a computer executable medium adapted to translate between extended grammar constructs of a machine readable language and basic grammar constructs of said machine readable language ("pre-compiler" in column 2, lines 53-68 to column 3, lines 1-6, pre-compiler is interpreted as a translator; supplemental language is interpreted as extended grammar constructs; and host language is interpreted as basic grammar constructs), wherein a translation comprises reading a source file containing extended grammar constructs, performing a lookup table conversion of said source file of extended grammar constructs into a basic source file containing only basic grammar constructs, said translator configured to implement one or more configurable levels of precompilation (column 3, lines 1-6; column 4, lines 55-68 to column 5, lines 1-21; and see Fig. 2; Multiple configurable levels of precompilation are shown in Figure 2, i.e., "Declaration Mode" is one level, and "SQL Statement" is another level.); and a compiler on a computer executable medium coupled to receive an output of said translator for compiling code written in said basic grammar constructs, wherein said compiler generates executable code implementing a function of the extended grammar constructs as compiled basic grammar

Art Unit: 2191

constructs (“The modified source file 22 can then be compiled by a host language compiler 24” in column 3, lines 13-16); wherein said source file with extended grammar constructs is associated with basic executables (“... procedure calls in the host language, and places them in a modified source file 22. ... The modified source file 22 can then be compiled by a host language compiler 24 ...” in column 3, lines 1-16; Thus, the extended source file 10 is input to a translator, which produces a corresponding basic source file 22 including basic executables, thereby associating the extended source file 10 with the basic executables.).

Chang does not explicitly teach that the machine readable language being ASN.1 or wherein said translation comprises a direct conversion from said source file to said basic source file. Bapat teaches that the machine readable language being ASN.1 (column 3, lines 10-16 and see Fig. 20, item 14 “ASN.1 SOURCE FILES WITH OBJECT CLASS DEFINITIONS”; ASN.1 source files contain ASN.1 grammar constructs, which is compiled into machine readable language). Li teaches wherein said translation comprises a direct conversion from said source file to said basic source file (column 3, lines 30-38).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Chang to include the machine readable language being ASN.1 and wherein said translation comprises a direct conversion from said source file to said basic source file using the teaching of Bapat and Li. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use standardized data structure protocol (Bapat, column 1, lines 27-38) and to parse source code without generating an intermediate file (Li, column 3, lines 20-23).

**Per Claim 6:**

This is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 1, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above, including “a first source file” (Chang, column 2, lines 59-60), “a second source file” (Chang, column 3, lines 3-6), and “multiple configurable levels of precompilation” (see Fig. 2; Multiple configurable levels of precompilation are shown in Figure 2, i.e., “Declaration Mode” is one level, and “SQL Statement” is another level.). Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

**Per Claim 11:**

This is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 1, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above, including “multiple configurable levels of precompilation” (see Fig. 2; Multiple configurable levels of precompilation are shown in Figure 2, i.e., “Declaration Mode” is one level, and “SQL Statement” is another level.). Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

**Per Claim 16:**

This is a computer-readable computer program product version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 1, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above, including “wherein said computer-readable program code is adapted to translate said extended grammar constructs into said basic grammar constructs by using one or more lookup tables” (Li, column 3, lines 30-38), and “multiple configurable levels of precompilation” (see Fig. 2; Multiple configurable levels of precompilation are shown in

Art Unit: 2191

Figure 2, i.e., “Declaration Mode” is one level, and “SQL Statement” is another level.). Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

11. Claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (U.S. 5,230,049) in view of Bapat (U.S. 5,291,583), further in view of Li (U.S. 6,063,133), and further in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA).

**Per Claim 3:**

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, neither Chang, Bapat nor Li explicitly teaches that the basic grammar constructs comprises X.680 grammar constructs. AAPA teaches that the basic grammar constructs comprises X.680 grammar constructs (pg. 1, line 32).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by the combination of Chang, Bapat and Li to include the basic grammar constructs comprising X.680 grammar constructs using the teaching of AAPA. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use a common basic compiler.

**Per Claim 4:**

The rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further, neither Chang, Bapat nor Li explicitly teaches that the extended grammar constructs comprises at least one of X.681, X.682,

Art Unit: 2191

or X.683 grammar constructs. AAPA teaches that the extended grammar constructs comprises at least one of X.681, X.682, or X.683 grammar constructs (pg. 1, lines 27-31).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by the combination of Chang, Bapat and Li to include the extended grammar constructs comprising at least one of X.681, X.682, or X.683 grammar constructs using the teaching of AAPA. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to develop applications using other grammar constructs.

**Per Claim 5:**

The rejection of claim 4 is incorporated, and Chang further teaches that the translator comprising one or more lookup tables (column 3, lines 1-6 and Fig. 1, item 36).

**Per Claim 8:**

This is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 4, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above.

Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

**Per Claim 9:**

This is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 3, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above.

Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.



Art Unit: 2191

**Per Claim 10:**

This is a method version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 5, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above, including “equivalent constructs” (Chang, column 3, lines 1-6). Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

**Per Claims 13-15:**

These are method versions of the claimed system discussed above (claims 3, 4, and 5, respectively), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious.

**Per Claim 18:**

This is a computer-readable computer program product version of the claimed system discussed above (claims 3 and 4), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments filed on 05/21/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

*In the remarks, the applicant argues that:*

Art Unit: 2191

- a) Chang fails to teach “wherein said source file with extended grammar constructs is associated with basic executables”.

*Examiner's response:*

- a) Chang teaches wherein said source file with extended grammar constructs is associated with basic executables (“... procedure calls in the host language, and places them in a modified source file 22. ... The modified source file 22 can then be compiled by a host language compiler 24 ...” in column 3, lines 1-16; Thus, the extended source file 10 is input to a translator, which produces a corresponding basic source file 22 including basic executables, thereby associating the extended source file 10 with the basic executables.). In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 10 for the rejection to claims 1, 6, 11 and 16.

*In the remarks, the applicant argues that:*

- b) Like Chang, Bapat appears to have nothing to do with translating extended grammar constructs into basic grammar constructs, “multiple configurable levels of precompilation”, or “wherein said compiler generates executable code implementing a function of the extended grammar constructs as compiled basic grammar constructs” or “wherein said translation comprises a direct conversion from said source file to said basic source file” or “wherein said source file with extended grammar constructs is associated with basic executables” as generally recited in the claims at issue.

*Examiner's response:*

Art Unit: 2191

b) In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Chang is relied upon for these limitations, not Bapat. In addition, the Examiner has already addressed applicant's arguments regarding Chang in the Examiner's Response (a) above. See the Examiner's Response (a) above.

*In the remarks, the applicant argues that:*

c) Li is relied on for allegedly teaching a "direct conversion". However, like Chang and Bapat, Li does not appear to relate, inter alia, to "wherein said source file with extended grammar constructs is associated with basic executables" as generally recited in the claims at issue.

*Examiner's response:*

c) In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Chang is relied upon for this limitation, not Bapat or Li. In addition, the Examiner has already addressed applicant's arguments regarding Chang in the Examiner's Response (a) above. See the Examiner's Response (a) above.

Art Unit: 2191

*In the remarks, the applicant argues that:*

d) APAA fails to relate in any way to a translator as recited in the claims at issue (indeed, that is a very object of the present invention), its combination with Chang, Li, and Bapat likewise fails to teach, suggest or imply the present invention.

*Examiner's response:*

d) In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Chang is relied upon for a translator, not Bapat or Li or APAA. In addition, the Examiner has already addressed applicant's arguments regarding Chang in the Examiner's Response (a) above. See the Examiner's Response (a) above.

### ***Conclusion***

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2191

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Qamrun Nahar whose telephone number is (571) 272-3730. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y Zhen, can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or processing is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Qamrun Nahar  
July 31, 2007

MARY STEELMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

